THE DAWN OF A NEW AGE

AND OTHER ESSAYS

W. W. PEARSON

THE DAWN OF A NEW AGE

AND OTHER ESSAYS

By W. W. PEARSON

S. GANESAN,
PUBLISHER, TRIPLICANE, MADRAS, S.E.
1922

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

A NEW age is dawning on us, an age of liberty, equality, and fraternity not only, but also of universal love. The signs of it are seen in the political and economic spheres as well as in the educational and the moral.

In this book, Mr. W. W. Pearson, whose associations with India are too well-known to need any reminding, points out with elaborate reference to the Irish, American and Japanese movements, that there is great scope in India for constructive work in the economic and the educational spheres. Analysing the salient features of the Tagore educational movement and Mahatma Gandhi's work and personality, he shows how they are essentially the harbingers in India of the dawn of the new age.

CONTENTS

THE DAWN OF A NEW AGE AND OTHER ESSAYS

I

THE DAWN OF A NEW AGE

AMIDST a widespread wretchedness such as the world has never known before, amidst famine and pestilence in Europe on a scale that defies the imagination to picture, and amidst a political and social unrest both in Europe and in Asia which makes the most optimistic sometimes despair, it seems almost absurd to speak of the Dawn of a New Age. On every side we see that the powers of evil seem to be in the ascendency. In Europe vengeance and hatred born of the Great War have reacted on the various nations until there is not a country which is not suffering the results of a false and vindictive peace. The statesmen who at present guide the external destinies of the nations have no wisdom and the people themselves seem to have no vision, and " where there is no vision the people perish ". It appears as if the very evils which the war was supposed to have destroyed have now returned in tenfold force to cast the world into a chaos of conflicting interests greater than history has ever known. The powers of darkness show themselves as outwardly more powerful and less ashamed than ever before. Half of Europe is in ruins and Western civilisation itself is threatened, while in Ireland, in Egypt, and in India we

have seen during the last two years events which would have been regarded as inconceivable fifty years ago in countries ruled over by a nation that calls itself civilised.

But these evils are but the outward and visible signs of the approaching and rapid decay of that which once was powerful, and symptoms of a terrified consciousness amongst those who at present rule by force that the reign of might is nearing its end. Anyone who knew the actual state of mind of the ruling classes in every part of the world before and during the war could have foreseen that such examples of cruelty and crime as have been witnessed were bound to show themselves, not as isolated instances of frightened officialdom, but as the logical outcome of the spirit in which one race competes with another or imposes its rule over the weak. These manifestations of the passing of the reign of Force only reveal the fact that those who ruled in the past are feeling acutely the wrench which inevitably accompanies the loss of power. A tiger when it has been wounded almost to death shows suddenly an overwhelming strength and tears at its prey with an even more savage brutality than when uninjured. But this fury is the sign of its approaching death, and not a symptom of renewed vitality.

It is therefore well not to be too pessimistic in our outlook on the world as it appears to us. Underlying the appearance there is a reality which is filled with hope, the hope of a new world. The very brutality of vengeance and the stupidity of repression are actually serving to bring to an end all the more rapidly the rule of Force and to bring in the reign of Freedom in every part of the world.

This is being proved with regard to Ireland, to Egypt,

and to India. Take the one example of Amritsar. It was a futile folly on the part of the Government of India to try and suppress the facts of the Punjab atrocities for eight months. Those eight months proved to be but the period of incubation necessary for the nemesis which is even yet not full grown. Wherever the governments of the Past are trying to preserve the old methods of governing the people, we find that the forces of freedom are proving too strong for them.

Throughout the whole world the old order is giving way before the new. It is not therefore surprising that there should be violent attempts on the part of those who were responsible for the old order to clutch desperately at the power which they feel is slipping from their grasp. A new order cannot come into being without the pain of travail. The old order cannot die without being conscious that its death is at hand. Energy is only wasted by futile regrets at the necessity for suffering as a means of the liberation of mankind. This suffering is the inevitable outcome of man's refusal to accept the only final solution, namely, that which is realised in human brotherhood and love. If violence and counter-violence are part of the price that has to be paid in physical pain and suffering, let us not be blind to the final goal, which is the ultimate liberation of all mankind.

But we cannot remain satisfied with a mere statement that pain and suffering are necessary accompaniments of the birth of a new age, or with the oft-repeated words that "the darkest hour precedes the dawn." We need some positive evidence of the Dawn itself before we can feel truly hopeful at the outlook for the Future. At present, power is in the hands of those who know only how to abuse it and lead the world into still greater

miseries, But how long will these rulers retain that power? Have not many of them already lost it? Many of those who were responsible for the so-called Peace, have lost their position not only in the world of politics but in the esteem of the world. The "war-lords" have fallen, and of the "Peacemakers" the very names of many of them have been forgotten. Lately in America Marshal Foch was almost unnoticed in a great convocation in which he was to be one of those honoured. The name of President Wilson alone will go down to posterity because of the ideals he expressed. It is true he failed to fulfil the high hopes which his spoken words raised, yet the very disappointment, world-wide in extent, at his failure to carry out his purpose was a measure of the intensity with which the common people in many countries had been inspired by the ideals which he proclaimed. When he came to Europe he was greeted by the common people as the saviour of the peoples because they believed he had come to establish a kingdom in which brotherhood and love should rule in the place of force and hatred. It seems clear that those who have been ruling the destinies of mankind during the last few years have reached the limits of their power, and now continue to exercise outward control only that they may complete the ruin which their political follies have begun.

There is still further proof of a great change coming over the world and that of a nature which cannot be concealed. It is that the nations are discovering with astonishing rapidity the undoubted fact that the unity of all mankind, which their statesmen told them during the war was so desirable, is now an actual necessity. The fact that the world is actually one, and that nations can no longer live the life of selfish isolation and com-

petition one with another, is being made clearer day by day. The need for food and clothing and houses is one which is experienced by every nation, and it is being realised that in the present condition of the world these necessities of life cannot be adequately supplied in any one nation without the help and co-operation of every other nation. We may take one example only. Hatred against the Soviet Government of Russia induced some of her neighbours to institute a blockade against that country. But after two years the need for raw materials and the desire for an open market in that vast and potentially wealthy land forced those same neighbours to lift the blockade. The stern necessity of economic facts supported the idealists, and the unity which the policy of politicians would deny to the world will be realised in spite of their utmost efforts to prevent its realisation.

Many people feel distressed because the Utopia of the idealists has to be realised forcibly by the pressure of economic conditions. But is this not really encouraging? The fact that the economic consequences of a bad and selfish Peace are such that the world has at last to accept the solution offered by the idealists, conclusively proves that the world in which we live is so constructed in its material aspect that it cannot hold together if attempts are made to found it upon base and ignoble aims.

A world which refuses to be hammered into the shape designed by diplomatists and capitalists, which falls into ruin and chaos at the touch of their coarse and callous hands must in its essential quality be a noble world, and one in which spiritual ideals must be meant eventually to triumph. The very structure and security of the world itself demands that a worldwide alliance between all the nations become a realised fact. The

Future then is not in the hands of the present rulers *except* in so far as they are preparing its foundations by clearing away the debris of the Past. The Future is with those whose names are unknown, but who are content to remain in obscurity having *faith in the true* peace of Mankind, and in a world ruled by Love. By their faith the world will be redeemed from its past and will be able to enter an era in which the whole of human life will be lifted to a higher plane.

Rabindranath Tagore has rightly called one of his most beautiful poems "Thanksgiving."

> "Those who walk in the path of pride crushing the lowly life under their tread, covering the tender green of the earth with their footprints in blood;
>
> "Let them rejoice, and thank thee, Lord, for the day is theirs.
>
> "But I am thankful that my lot lies with the humble who suffer and bear the burden of power, and hide their faces and stifle their sobs in the dark.
>
> "For every throb of their pain has pulsed in the secret depth of the night, and every insult has been gathered into thy great silence.
>
> "And the morrow is theirs.
>
> "O Sun, rise upon the bleeding hearts blossoming in flowers of the morning, and the torchlight revelry of pride shrunken to ashes."

"For the morrow is theirs." The dawn of that morrow is already breaking and it will soon be the day. Is that merely a hope, or a truth revealed to the mind of the poet? It is true because poets and prophets are always more in touch with the realities of the universe than are those who think they are guiding the destinies of nations.

But is the vision that is seen by prophets destined

never to be realised, and the hope which has sent so many to endure the sufferings of martyrdom never to be achieved? Nearly a hundred years ago the greatest of all modern prophets, Mazzini, wrote in his "Faith and *the Future*":—

"Have faith, then, O ye that suffer for the noble cause, apostles of a Truth that even to-day the world ignores, ye soldiers of the holy battles which the world condemns and calls rebellious. To-morrow, perhaps, that world, to-day incredulous or careless, will bow with fervour before you. To-morrow, victory will crown your crusading banner. Onward in faith, and fear not. That which Christ did Humanity can do. Believe, and you will conquer. Believe, and the peoples will end by following you. . . .

"From your cross of misfortune and persecution announce the whole faith of the Age; but few days will pass ere it receive its consecration of faith. Let your lips not utter the cry of hate, nor the conspirator's hollow phrase, but the tranquil, solemn word of the days that are to come. From our cross of poverty and proscription, we, the men of exile, who represent in our heart and faith the races of the enslaved, the millions doomed to silence, we will reply to you and say to our brothers: *The alliance is made.* Hurl at your persecutors the legend GOD and HUMANITY. For yet a little time they may rebel and strive against it and stammer blasphemy. But the masses will worship it."

Must we believe that century after century the peoples are to remain in a state of servitude because of their lack of faith? It seems only too clear, as we view the events of the last few years, that the "day is theirs who tread in the path of pride," and even those who are

themselves idealists and have given their lives to the service of an ideal, *hope* rather than know that the dawn of a new day is at hand. What facts are there which help us not only to hope but to *know* that the Dawn is already brightening the distant darkness of the world's horizon, and that the "HOLY ALLIANCE OF THE PEOPLES" is actually about to be accomplished?

"It is important to proclaim a New Age," said Mazzini a hundred years ago, and he himself proclaimed it because he was certain that:

> "We stand to-day between two ages, between the grave of one world and the cradle of another, between the last boundary of the individualistic philosophy and the threshold of HUMANITY."

Mazzini was right but he spoke of that which was not yet understood by mankind as a whole, and it was for this reason that the Dawn which he saw on the horizon, by the enlightenment of his own idealism, has tarried for a century. But now there is in every part of the world an atmosphere so clear that the long delayed Dawn can be seen by all, because for the first time in the history of man the ideals which Mazzini preached are being understood not by a few select souls only but by all men. During the War, although it had as its cause the greeds and fears of the nations of the West, there sprang up a new language of Humanity which was used by all the people of the world. It was used even by the statesmen whose policies had produced the war, for they found, after the first enthusiasm of patriotism had abated, that the vocabulary of freedom was useful for keeping up the enthusiasm of their countries.

They used it constantly, reiterating the phrases of liberty and fraternity until they sank deep into the

consciousness of the nations. It was President Wilson who used the idioms of this new language with the greatest effect during the latter stages of this war, and those who saw how he was received by the people of England and France when he came to Europe, can understand how deeply the minds of men and women had been influenced by his idealism. In Germany itself just before the Armistice, I am told by one who was interned in Berlin during the war, the enthusiaism for the ideals of President Wilson was intense and his name was looked upon with devotion by all the liberal and progressive minds of Germany. It is useless for the statesmen, now that their need for misleading the people is over, to drop that phraseology and to adopt the same insane policies which swept the world into the orbit of their own disastrous and destructive follies.

Now " when danger decamps
They bury the word with the deed."

Under the tense and strenuous emotions of war time, the minds of men were peculiarly susceptible to the influences of ideas and ideals, and they cannot now be suddenly persuaded that after all hatred and greed are best. Now they can never be turned back and led again to destruction under the impulse of mere catch-words. This time the watchword of Freedom will truly make them free, and however strenuously the statesmen struggle to lead them again in the old paths, they will refuse to be led, but will in their turn become the leaders.

This was very clearly seen during the recent visits of Rabindranath Tagore to the various countries of the Continent of Europe. Wherever he went, the forces of idealism rallied round him and nothing was more striking than the way the students in every University

centre looked eagerly to him for inspiration and leadership. There is not the shadow of a doubt that the Youth of the World are ready for a new revelation and are now expecting a New Era. The fact that there is much that is discouraging in the present state of Europe should not rob us of our hope. A reaction was to be expected after the exhaustion of the Great War. As Aurobindo Ghose writes in one of his recent books :—

> " The forces of the old world, the forces of despotism, the forces of traditional privilege and selfish exploitation, the forces of unfraternal strife and passionate self-regarding competition are always struggling to re-seat themselves on the thrones of the earth. A determined movement of reaction is evident in many parts of the world and nowhere perhaps more than in England which was once one of the self-styled champions of progress and liberty. The attempt to go back to the old spirit is one of those necessary returns without which it cannot be so utterly exhausted as to be blotted out from the evolution. It rises only to be defeated and crushed again. On the other hand, the force of the democratic tendency is not a force which has had the greater part of its enjoyment but one which is still vigorous, unsatisfied and eager for fulfilment. Every attempt to coerce it in the past reacted eventually on the coercing force and brought back the democratic spirit fierce, hungry and unsatisfied, joining to its fair motto of " Liberty, Equality and Fraternity " the terrible addition of " Death ". It is not likely that the immediate future of the democratic tendency will satisfy the utmost dreams of the lover of liberty who seeks an anarchist freedom, or of the lover of equality who tries to establish a socialistic dead level or of the fraternity who dreams of a world-embracing com-

munism. But some harmonisation of this great ideal is undoubdtedly the immediate future of the human race. On the old forces of despotism, inequality and unbridled competition, after they have been once more overthrown, a process of gradual *sanyama* will be performed by which what has to remain of them will be regarded as the disappearing vestiges of a dead reality and without any further violent coercion be transformed slowly and steadily out of existence."

But one aspect of this idealistic movement amongst the more thoughtful youth of Europe is arresting to those of us who have the future welfare of India at heart. It is this. Almost invariably these young men and women with a great vision and a high hope are looking towards India for their inspiration. The true welfare of India can only be realised in its fulness when India has realised her mission to the world. "Ex orientellux" is not only the motto of an old English University but is also the hope of the new generation in the West. From the East must come the Dawn. This should carry to every Indian a feeling of heavy and urgent responsibility, and should make those who are fighting in India for freedom realise that more important than the actual gaining of liberty is the use that India will make of her freedom when she has won it. More urgent than any change in the form of government, more imperative than a political victory, is the question of whether India will be true to her *Dharma* and thus take her rightful position of leadership amongst the nations of the world. To quote once more the words of Aurobindo Ghose :—

"Our aim will therefore be to help in building up India for the sake of humanity—this is the spirit of the Nationalism which we profess and follow. We say to humanity, "The time has come when you must

take the great step and rise out of a material existence into the higher, deeper and wider life towards which humanity moves. The problems which have troubled mankind can only be solved by conquering the kingdom within, not by harnessing the forces of Nature to the service of comfort and luxury, but by mastering the forces of the intellect and the spirit, by vindicating the freedom of man within as well as without and by conquering from within external Nature. For that work the resurgence of Asia is necessary, therefore Asia rises. For that work the freedom and greatness of India is essential, therefore she claims her destined freedom and greatness, and it is to the interest of all humanity, not excluding England, that she should wholly establish her claim!"

India is undergoing this renaissance and the Youth of the world will owe to India a debt of gratitude if Young India is true to the highest ideals of the Motherland. Benjamin Kidd in his last book, "The Science of Power," points out that the clue to the future civilisation is to be found in the fact that "Power in the highest form of integration will win". Where in every country can this highest form of integration be found? The answer of Benjamin Kidd is that the centre of Power in the coming order of civilisation will be Woman. This is a fact that is now becoming clearer day by day, for in every part of the world, not excluding India, woman is attaining an influence over the practical developments of modern life greater than she has ever had before. Already she has used that power for beneficial ends, and in Europe as a result of the devastating effect of the War on the manhood of the nations, the education of the young is more and more in the hands of the women. Women are by nature more idealistic than

men and show a much more idealistic attitude towards the problems of human life. But there is a still further factor in the present state of the world that cannot be overlooked, and that is that in spite of attempts on the part of those in power to re-establish the old selfish aims of a narrow and arrogant patriotism, the youth of humanity refuses to take for granted all that the "elder statesmen" tell them. The headmaster of a well-known public school in England recently stated in public: "Boys of this generation are far more in earnest than the boys of my youth. They are thinking of the great questions which confront the nation to-day, and I would rather take the judgment of my sixth form than the judgment of the House of Commons. That is not saying much, it is true, but they are at least in earnest and bent upon getting to the bottom of things. Despite all criticism the public schools of to-day are out not to make scholars but to make citizens, and if the nation tampers in any way with the spirit they nurture, it will do so at its own peril."

Youth is idealistic by temperament and to youth therefore we can appeal when idealists are needed. Benjamin Kidd, in speaking of "the emotion of the ideal" which he regards as the supreme factor in the shaping of the new civilisation, says: "The first remarkable feature of the emotion of the ideal is that it is an attitude of mind which is most highly developed in the child." The truth of this statement is found wherever we find children. They respond almost instantaneously to a great ideal. One day I read to a group of children from the poorest homes in the slums of London, the story, as told by Sister Nivedita, of Gautama Buddha. I watched the growing wonder and reverence on their faces as they listened to the story of the Great Renunciation. They

were hushed and still, and at the end one of them asked me with awe in her voice: "Is he still alive?"

It is this characteristic of the young all the world over which is the greatest assurance of the ultimate unity of the human race. Now, as never before, the race of mankind is ready and responsive to the great message that "All men are brothers.' No statesman can now stop man from accepting the ideals of universal brotherhood and love if only those who believe in those ideals concentrate on the young. We can leave the politicians to weave their own shrouds while the young are quietly and unobtrusively building the foundations of the New World.

Signs are already visible that the foundations have been begun. In July 1921 there took place in London an International meeting of Boy Scouts. Representatives of 27 different countries were pesent, including countries so far apart as China and Chili. For the first time in history Boys met together from all over the world, as members of one great family for the cultivation of that mutual sympathy and understanding without which no League of Nations can be truly founded. These boys do not possess the worldly wisdom of the politicians of the countries they came to represent, but they possess what is of infinitely greater value, namely, the idealism of Youth upon which can be established the New World Order.

To us who believe in youth there should come this message of hope and inspiration. "Blessed are the Young for of such is the Kingdom of the Future. The New Age is at hand, because it is in the hands of the Young."

II

PRACTICAL SWARAJ

"The evolution of humanity beyond its present level depends absolutely on its power to unite and create true social organisms."

"The beauty of great civilisations has been built up far more by the people working together than by any corporate action of the State."

"A. E."

IT is now no longer necessary to discuss whether Swaraj is attainable or not in India. Our observation tells us that it is already in being. Wherever a man or a woman refuses to be enslaved, wherever inner freedom and self-mastery are highly valued, there we have true Swaraj. The people of India have at last realised that the old state of subjection was an intolerable form of slavery, and the desire for Swaraj can no longer be stifled either by a foreign bureaucracy which has lost its moral right to rule nor by those politicians who plead for caution and compromise.

It is, however, more than ever necessary to discover a practical policy which shall be an outward expression of that true independence which is a proof of character and is the outcome of self-respect and discipline.

The present flood of profound love and enthusiasm for the Motherland, which rejoices the heart of all true lovers of India, would be a dangerous symptom if it

were not accompanied by wisdom of purpose and steadfast self-sacrifice. Nothing is more encouraging than the action of students in going out into the village to work for the people and to serve the sick and uneducated. But enthusiasm alone is apt to wane, and in order such work of the young men of India may bear its fullest fruits it is necessary to find ways in which its effects may be made permanent.

Every contribution to this problem must be welcome, and it is for this reason that I am writing this account of a remarkable book which I feel has a message for India at the present time when her young men are seeking for ways of serving their country in the spirit of free self-surrender. The book is entitled "The National Being: Some thoughts on an Irish Polity." The author, Mr. George Russell, "A. E.", is one of the noblest living Irishmen. He has done much to help Sir Horace Plunkett in the development of the Co-operative Movement in Agricultural districts of Ireland, and is one of those rare idealists who is at the same time a practical man.

There is such a close parallel between Ireland and India, not only in the fact of her political subjection but also in the nature of her national problems, that the solution offered by "A. E." in this book seems as if it were specially written for India. The problems of Ireland are largely agricultural, so are those of India. Her needs, as are those of India also, are the needs of the rural population and not those of the towns.

Early in this book the author deals with the danger among politicians of attempting to model their form of Self-government on lines borrowed from the "Mother of Parliaments". "A. E." points out that this danger should be strenuously avoided, for, if there is anything

in the theory of nationality then each country ought to apply to its national problems its own original principles, as they are from time to time discovered to be fundamental to the character of the nation in question. Further, he argues that the parliamentary form of government has proved itself ineffective. There can be no doubt that India has its original contribution to make to the theory and practice of government, and that she has too long believed in government by parliament as truly democratic. She has discovered by bitter experience the hollow futility of Parliamentary rule, and it is time that she ceases to trust in a system which has, even in the country of its birth, proved itself bankrupt and self-condemned. For, representative government has ceased to exist in England. G. K. Chesterton has said of it that:

> " Parliament has abdicated in favour of the Cabinet, and the Cabinet has abdicated in favour of Mr. Lloyd George."

This age is often spoken of as the age of Democracy, but as " A. E." says:

> " We have no more a real democracy in the world to-day. Democracy in politics has in no country led to Democracy in its economic life."

In fact in countries, such as England and America, which boast of their democratic principles, the people are the slaves of an oligarchy. Capitalistic and industrial interests rule. The old Panchayat system of India was more truly democratic in practice than either the republican system of America or the parliamentary system of Great Britain. And it may well be that the new form of government in India will revert to the Village Panchayat system while at the same time accepting some form of co-operation such as is outlined

in "A. E."-'s book, and which has been carried into effect by "A. E." himself and by Sir Horace Plunkett.

But whatever form the new government of India by Indians may take, it will be of far less importance than the positive work undertaken by the people who desire to serve her. An unbounded confidence in what its humanity can do is the necessary precursor of a nation's greatness. The fact that thousands of students in Bengal, and other parts of India, have this unbounded confidence is the most hopeful sign of the present times. But this confidence must be expressed in co-operation. Non-co-operation with the present Government is undoubtedly necessary as a preliminary act for freeing ourselves from the fettering shackles of the past, but "to be positive is always better than to be negative" and co-operation between those who desire to serve India will do more for the attainment of Swaraj than any amount of negative action.

In a leading article in "The Servant" early in January these words occurred:

> "We believe that the non-co-operation movement has now arrived at a point where the most pressing need is for a decentralized programme. The nation lives in the villages and not in the towns and cities; it is therefore among the villagers that the great work of national reconstruction must be begun."

There is nothing negative about this, and this need has been recognised by many ever since the Swadeshi movement many years ago. But until now many efforts to serve the village communities have been frustrated by the suspicions of the police and the activities of the C. I. D. We can now look forward to a time when such obstacles will have ceased to exist, but the obstacles will now be internal rather than external, and possibly

we shall find these even more difficult to overcome. Our efforts will have to be directed towards conquering our own weaknesses and sustaining our endeavour at the level of our first enthusiasm.

It is to the young men of India that we look for the regeneration of the country. They have the moving force of youthful enthusiasm and faith in the infinite possibilities of their country. But there lies before us a long road of effort and endeavour in which feelings alone will not be sufficient to carry us over the rough and toilsome places. Will and thought must take the place of enthusiasm, and excited political controversies must give way to persistent and constant effort.

"A. E." warns us of this danger when he writes as follows:

> "What too many people in Ireland mistake for thoughts are feelings. It is enough to them to vent likes or dislikes, inherited prejudices or passions, and they think when they have expressed feeling they have given utterance to thought. The nature of our political controversies provoked passion, and passion has become dominant in our politics. Passion truly is a power in humanity, but it should never enter into national policy. It is a dangerous element in human life, though it is an essential part of our strangely compounded nature. But in national life it is the most dangerous of all guides. There are springs of power in ourselves which in passion we draw on and are amazed at their depth and intensity, yet we do not make these the master light of our being, but rather those divine laws which we have apprehended and brooded upon, and which shine with clear and steady light in our souls. Now the State is higher in the scale of being than the individual, and it should be

dominated solely by moral and intellectual principles. These are not the outcome of passion or prejudice, but of arduous thought. National ideals must be built up with the same conscious deliberation of purpose as the architect of the Parthenon conceived its lofty harmony of shining marble lines, or as the architect of Rheims Cathedral designed its intricate magnificence and mystery.'

What then, according to "A. E.", is the necessity laid upon all those who, whether in India or in Ireland, want to build up the new civilisation? It is to work so that "their external life correspond in some measure to their internal dream."

With regard to Ireland he writes:

"We may say with certainty that the external circumstances of people are a measure of their inner life. Our mean and disordered little country towns in Ireland, with their drinkshops, their disregard for cleanliness or beauty, accord with the character of the civilians who inhabit them. Whenever we develop an intellectual life these things will be altered, but not in priority to the spiritual mood. House by house, village by village, the character of a civilization changes as the character of the individuals change. When we begin to build up a lofty world within the national soul, soon the country becomes beautiful and worthy of respect in its externals. That building up of the inner world we have neglected. Our excited political controversies, our playing at militarism, have tended to bring men's thought from central depths to surfaces. Life is drawn to its frontiers away from its spiritual base, and behind the surfaces we have little to fall back on. Few of our notorieties could be trusted to think out any economic or social problem

thoroughly and efficiently. They have been engaged in passionate attempts at the readjustment of the superficies of things. What we require more than men of action at present are scholars, economists, scientists, thinkers, educationalists, and litterateurs, who will populate the desert depths of national consciousness with real thought and turn the void into a fullness."

Apply to India what "A. E." says of Ireland and I think we shall see how timely his words are:

"Those who love India nobly desire for her the highest of human destinies. They would ransack the ages and accumulate wisdom to make Indian life seem as noble in men's eyes as any the world has known. The better minds in every race, eliminating passion and prejudice by the exercise of the imaginative reason, have revealed to their countrymen ideals which they recognised were implicit in national character. It is such discoveries we have yet to make about ourselves to unite us to fulfil our destiny. We have to discover what is fundamental in Indian character, the affections, leanings, tendencies towards one or more of the eternal principles which have governed and inspired all great human effort, all great civilizations from the dawn of history. A nation is but a host of men united by some God-begotten mood, some hope of liberty or dream of power or beauty or justice or brotherhood, and until that master idea is manifested to us there is no shining star to guide the ship of our destinies.

"We have to do for India—though we hope with less arrogance—what the long and illustrious line of German thinkers, scientists, poets, philosophers, and historians did for Germany, or what the poets and

artists of Greece did for the Athenians: and that is, to create national ideals which will dominate the policy of statesmen, the actions of citizens, the universities, the social organizations, the administration of State departments, and unite in one spirit urban and rural life."

Now this means not only arduous thought but strenuous and consistent action. Many years ago when I was speaking to a group of students in Calcutta I quoted from a book about Ireland. It described how a young Irish patriot, who had looked forward to a political career in the cause of his country's freedom, was told by his priest to serve Ireland by living amongst her people and serving them as their comrade. It meant giving up the fame and popularity of a political career of great promise, but this youth chose a life of daily drudgery in an obscure village because he realised that in that way he was helping to free his countrymen from what was far more fatal than political subjection, namely, subjection to ignorance, indolence, and vice. In every country the attainment of true Swaraj can only be achieved by means such as these, and "A. E." shows us the way in which practical Swaraj is being attained in Ireland.

"We do right to expect great things from the State, but we ought to expect still greater things from ourselves."

"The national idealism which will not go into the fields and deal with the fortunes of the working farmers is false idealism." "A. E."

Let us now turn to the methods proposed by "A. E." for the development of this new civilisation. It is clear that the means are *not political*, but economic and educational.

The Irish Agricultural Organization Society is in Ireland the organ of effective action. It is described as "a swing back to Ireland's traditional and natural *com-*

munism in work." This means that it is rooted in the best traditions of Ireland's past. Instead of attempting to introduce a poor copy of an alien system the desire has been to apply to modern conditions the priniciples original and fundamental in the Irish nation.

Now just as in Ireland the main industry is agriculture, so is it in India, and therefore the chief problem of India is the same as that of Ireland, namely, "how to enable the countryman, without journeying, to satisfy to the full his economic, social, intellectual and spiritual needs."

The means, we have said, are twofold, first economic, secondly educational. Of these apparently the economic is the more urgent. In a recent conversation I had with Sir Horace Plunkett in America we discussed the work of the co-operative movement in Ireland. He stated that we have to recognise the need of persuading men of the economic benefits of co-operation before we can induce them to co-operate on other matters. Over and over again he has found that when men in a country district in Ireland have discovered the economic advantages of co-operation they have begun to co-operate for educational and social welfare. His invariable experience has been that co-operation for selfish ends leads inevitably to co-operation for mutual advantage. Altruism follows when a firm basis of economic prosperity has been established, simply because the very act of co-operating for a common end unconsciously leads to a desire to combine for the benefit of all.

The considered opinion of a man of such long experience in co-operation as Sir Horace Plunkett is one that we would be wise not to neglect. It is therefore important for those who wish to serve India, and to develop amongst her people the spirit of co-operation, to study

the best methods of introducing co-operation into her economic life.

The political motive must be replaced by the economic. When a whole people lives on the very verge of perpetual starvation it is useless to appeal to them on the plane of politics. However much they may believe that their miserable condition is due to a defective political system or an alien form of government, so long as they need food and are in a state of economic servitude no amount of political propaganda will be of any use in alleviating their condition. It is therefore more important to teach the village communities of India how to co-operate for their mutual benefit than it is to preach to them the duty of non-co-operation with the present Government. Establish in the villages strong and self-respecting communities founded upon a firm basis of mutual trust and economic prosperity, and inevitably Swaraj will follow. The mere departure of British bureaucrats from India does not mean Swaraj though it is an essential preliminary, for with an alien government we have found that freedom of action is impossible. If the British were to leave India to-morrow Swaraj would not necessarily follow. *Swaraj means more than a change of masters, it means that we learn to master ourselves,* and that can only be achieved by a long process of self-discipline.

In Ireland this process of self-discipline has been going on in various districts of the country ever since the founding of the Irish Agricultural Organization Society thirty years ago. Although it may seem as if the fruits of those years of labour have many of them been destroyed by the armed and undisciplined forces of the Crown, it is not so in reality. For it is almost certain that the members of this Society, as a result of

their training in co-operation, will prove to be the most efficient members of the new Irish Administration. British soldiers may have destroyed the Society's creameries, but they cannot destroy the spirit of co-operation which has been developed during the years of the Society's existence.

Outside this movement the Irish are unorganised and helpless. They are separated from each other and are weak because they cannot act together.

Before this Society was founded the Irish farmer produced, but for himself alone and not for the community in which he lived. This was false economy as it is also in India, for it meant that instead of combining with his neighbours for the purchase of his necessities and the sale of his produce he paid more for what he bought than he need have done because he bought in small quantities and had to pay carriage on small parcels, and got a lower price for his produce than he might have done if he had been organised with his neighbours. He never realised that if he combined with his neighbours he could purchase his seed, for example, at wholesale prices and have it brought in bulk from some wholesale market. Instead of buying his household necessities at a central Store he had to buy them at one of the host of small shops which existed in every district of Ireland and which, because they themselves had to buy in small quantities, charged more than the real value of the goods to the consumer. When he sold eggs, butter or bacon he had to sell them to a local dealer and he rarely knew where his produce went to, so that his horizon was limited to his own district and he knew little or nothing of such things as world markets. The acts of the Government which ruled over him did not interest him, for he did not realise the effect they

had on his own life, on the price of his farm produce or of his daily necessities. His methods of agriculture differed little from the traditional methods which prevailed in the 18th century, and he was never told how, by combination with his neighbouring farmers, he could use improved machinery for his ploughing, sowing and reaping.

But with the coming of the Agricultural Organization Society all this was changed. Those who came into the orbit of this Society's activities learnt for the first time that *isolated and individualistic agricultural production is wasteful* and false economy. But further than this they came to learn that " The difficulty of moving the countryman, which has become traditional, is not due to the fact that he lives in the country, but to the fact that he lives in an unorganised society."

Let " A. E." describe the change which comes to the individual:

> " The co-operative movement connects with living links the home, the centre of Patrick's being, to the nation, the circumference of his being. It connects him with the nation through membership of a national movement, not for the political purposes which call on him for a vote once every few years, but for economic purposes which affect him in the course of his daily occupations. This organization of the most numerous section of the Irish democracy into co-operative associations, as it devolops and embraces the majority, will tend to make the nation one and indivisible and conscious of its unity. The individual, however meagre his natural endowment of altruism, will be led to think of the community as himself; because his income, his social pleasures even, depend on the success of the local and national organizations with which he is connected."

"We can imagine him as a member of a committee getting hints of a strange doctrine called science from his creamery manager. He hears about bacteria, and these dark invisibles replace, as the cause of bad butter-making, the wicked fairies of his childhood. Watching this manager of his society he learns a new respect for the man of special or expert knowledge. Discussing the business of his association with other members he becomes something of a practical economist. He knows now where his produce goes. He learns that he has to compete with Americans, Europeans, and Colonials—indeed with the farmers of the world, hitherto concealed from his view by a mountainous mass of middlemen. He begins to be interested in these countries and reads about them. He becomes a citizen of the world. His horizon is no longer bounded by the wave of blue hills beyond his village. The roar of the planet begins to sound in his years. What is more important is that he is becoming a better citizen of his own country. He meets on his committee his religious and political opponents, not now discussing differences but identities of interest. He also meets the delegates from other soiceties in District Conferences or general congresses, and local co-operation leads on to national co-operation. The best intellects, the best business men in the societies, meet in the big centres as directors of federations and wholesales, and they get an all-Ireland view of their industry. They see the parish from the point of view of the nation, and this vision does not desert them when they go back to the parish. They realise that their interests are bound up with national interests, and they discuss legislation and administration with practical knowledge. Eyes getting keener every year,

minds getting more instructed, begin to concentrate on Irish public men. Presently Patrick will begin to seek for men of special knowledge and administrative ability to manage Irish affairs."

Having described the change to the individual let us see what change comes to the community. He writes:—

"More changes often take place within a dozen years after a co-operative society is first started than have taken place for a century previous. I am familiar with a district in the north-west of Ireland. It was a most wretchedly poor district. The farmers were at the mercy of the traders and the agricultural middlemen. Then a dozen years ago a co-operative society was formed. I am sure that the oldest inhabitant would agree with me that more changes have taken place since the co-operative society was started than he could remember in all his previous life. The farmers control their own buying and selling. Their organization markets for them the eggs and poultry. It procures seeds, fertilizers, and domestic requirements. It turns the members' pigs into bacon. They have a village hall and a woman's organization. They sell the products of the women's industry. They have a co-operative band, social gatherings, and concert. They have spread out into half-a-dozen parishes, going southward and westward with their propaganda and in half-a-dozen years, in all that district, previously without organization, there will be well-organized farmers' guilds, concerntrating in themselves the trade of their district, and having funds, or profits, the joint property of the community, which can be drawn upon to finance their undertakings. I assert that there can never be any progress in rural districts or any real prosperity without such farmers' organizations or

guilds. Wherever rural prosperity is reported of any country, inquire into it, and it will be found that it depends on rural organization. Wherever there is rural decay, if it is inquired into, it will be found that there was a rural population but no rural community, no organization, no guild to promote common interests and unite the countrymen in defence of them."

Wherever in Ireland a Co-operative Society has been started there we see that farmers are able to do things which as individuals they would have found it impossible to do. The Society is in the first place a better buyer than the individual. It can buy an expensive threshing machine and let its members have the use of it, thus saving enormous labour. The individual farmer would not be able to purchase such a machine even with the savings of years. It can also buy the seed required by its members at wholesale prices and also the fertilisers for their fields. The Society is also a better producer, for in the same way it can afford to buy expensive plants for making butter, etc., which would be entirely beyond the purse of the individual farmer. I believe that in a certain zemindary in Bengal the ryots have combined to purchase a rice-husking machine, and that they have already saved the original cost of the machine by the saving effected by husking their own rice in bulk. The co-operative idea is capable of infinite variation, the most attractive of its manysided influence being that which affects the social life of the village communities, bringing brightness and interest into the lives of those whose lives have hitherto been notoriously dull and uninteresting. Let "A. E." give in his own words his vision of the future possibilities of the cooperative movement in Ireland:

"The organized rural community of the future will

generate its own electricity at its central buildings, and run not only its factories and other enterprises by this power, but will supply light to the houses of its members and also mechanical power to run machinery on the farm. One of our Irish societies already supplies electric light for the town it works in. In the organized rural community the eggs, milk, poultry, pigs, cattle, grain, and wheat produced on the farm and not consumed, or required for further agricultural production, will automatically be delivered to the co-operative business centre of the district, where the manager of the dairy will turn the milk into butter or cheese, and the skim milk will be returned to feed the community's pigs. The poultry and egg department will pack and dispatch the fowls and eggs to market. The mill will grind the corn and return it ground to the member. The community will hold in common all the best machinery too expensive for the members to buy individually. The agricultural labourers will gradually become skilled mechanics, able to direct threshers, binders, diggers, cultivators, and new implements we have no conception of now. They will be members of the society sharing in its profits in proportion to their wages, even as the farmer will in proportion to his trade. The co-operative community will have its own carpenters, smiths, mechanics, employed in its workshop at repairs or in making those things which can profitably be made locally. One happy invention after another will come to lighten the labour of life. There will be, of course, a village hall with a library and gymnasium, where the boys and girls will be made straight, athletic, and graceful. In the evenings, when the work of the day is done, if we went into the village

hall we would find a concert going on with the village choir or band. There would be a committee room where the council of the community would meet once a week. In years when the society was exceptionally prosperous, and earned larger profits than usual on its trade we should expect to find discussions in which all the members would join as to the use to be made of these profits: whether they should be altogether divided or what portion of them should be devoted to some public purpose. We may be certain that there would be animated discussions, because a real solidarity of feeling would have arisen and a pride in the work of the community engendered, and they would like to the able to outdo the good work done by the neighbouring communities.

"One might like to endow the village school with a chemical laboratory, another might want to decorate the village hall with reproductions of famous pictures, another might suggest removing all the hedges and planting the roadsides and lanes with gooseberry bushes, currant bushes, and fruit trees, as they do in some German communes to-day. The teaching in the village school would be altered to suit the new social order, and the children of the community would, we may be sure, be instructed in everything necessary for the intelligent conduct of the communal business. Intelligence would be organized as well as business. The women would have their own associations, to promote domestic economy, care of the sick and the children. They would have their own industries of embroidery, crochet, lace, dressmaking, weaving, spinning, or whatever new industries the awakened intelligence of women may devise and lay hold of as the peculiar labour of their sex. The business of

distribution of the produce and industries of the community would be carried on by great federations, which would attend to export and sale of the products of thousands of societies. Such communities would be real social organisms. The individual would be free to do as he willed, but he would find that communal activity would be infinitely more profitable than individual activity. We would then have a real democracy carrying on its own business, and bringing about reforms without pleading to, or begging of, the State, or intriguing with or imploring the aid of political middlemen to get this, that or the other done for them. They would be self-respecting, because they would be self-helping above all things. The national councils and meetings of national federations would finally become the real Parliament of the nation; for wherever all the economic power is centered, there also is centered all the political power. And no politician would dare to interfere with the organized industry of a nation."

As there is nothing to prevent such communities being formed in Ireland so there is nothing to prevent the formation of similar communities in India. We have here a practical policy of Swaraj which has been actually applied in Ireland and which could equally well be applied in India. There would no doubt be slight differences of detail in the co-operative organisation which would have to be started in rural districts of Bengal and other Provinces of India, but the main lines would be similar to those which have been successfully started in Ireland, in Germany and in Denmark. The rural community needs to be helped in its growth and the seed which must be planted is the seed of Co-operation. For whatever purpose a Co-operative Society may be

started it has proved in Ireland to be an omniverous feeder. It exercises a magnetic influence on all agricultural activities. It will do the same in India. From the wide experience of men like "A. E." and Sir Horace Plunkett it has been proved that the appeal has first to be made to the farmer and agriculturist on economic grounds, and it has to be proved that it is to his advantage financially to co-operate. The rest will follow. The idealist will come into his own when the economist has built the foundations. What ought now to be done in India is to start, in every district where workers can be found, Co-operative Societies based on the natural desire of the people to buy cheaply what they need for the success of their farming and to sell their produce at the highest price possible. To do this workers must be trained and taught the elements at least of co-operation by those who have studied the subject either theoretically or practically. Would it not be possible for classes to be started in Calcutta and other great centres where students anxious to serve the rural population could study "Principles of Co-operation"? Where possible, trained economists and those who have had some practical experience of the needs of the agricultural population should be employed to teach.

Wherever such experiments are started there would be an expression of practical Swaraj, for there we would have men trained in that spirit of independence which is the only real independence because it is the independence of the spirit.

III

EDUCATING BY LOVE

"We may either smother the divine fire of youth or we may feed it. We may either stand stupidly staring as it sinks into a murkey fire of crime and flares into the intermittent blaze of folly or we may tend it into a lambent flame with power to make clean and bright our dingy city streets."
JANE ADDAMS.

A STRIKING sign of the Dawn of a New Age is the way in which new experiments are being tried in education and in the treatment of socalled "juvenile delinquents" in the more progressive countries of the West.

Recently in Holland I visited a Reformatory for boys which was said to be a model one. It was situated in beautiful country, a high ground overlooking extensive pine woods, and the buildings were impressive. But the entrance was like that of a prison. We were admitted by a janitor who unlocked the doors and sent for the Superintendent. He was a tall bearded man with a stern expression but a kindly smile. What struck me most was a large bunch of keys which was fastened by a chain round his waist. These he used for opening, and closing behind us, every door through which we passed. An air of oppressive silence surrounded the place although there were five hundred boys in the buildings. We were taken through classrooms equipped in the most up-to-date manner, a

manual training room, and a magnificent gymnasium, but wherever we came across boys they looked gloomy and depressed. At one stage in our round of inspection the Superintendent grimly unlocked two iron doors and showed us a solitary cell in which was standing an unfortunate boy of about fourteen, without a chair or a stool to sit on, without any books to read and imprisoned within double walls so as to prevent any sound of crying from reaching beyond the walls of his own cell. I was told that he was being punished for having run away. Probably of all the boys in the institution he was the one who most loved liberty, and to him was being given this hideous form of punishment. I was shown the shower baths and the "observation gallery" in which an attendant watched "to prevent any attempt at suicide"! Then I was taken to the dormitories. There each boy slept in a locked cell-like cubicle which separated him from his companions. These cubicles were decorated in a way that showed the craving for self-expression on the part of the individual inmate. In some the walls were covered with brightly coloured drawings, while in others were photographs of mother, father, brothers or sisters. In a large number a crucifix was hanging above the bed. As I was passing through one of the corridors I waved my hand to a youngster who was working outside the kitchen and he waved back. But I was told by the friend who was with me that the boy would get into trouble if he had been seen waving to a visitor.

Just before leaving the building I was taken into a room the door of which was not locked. Inside there was a laughing group of older boys who came up and crowded round the visitors, talking and chatting with them in quite a happy way. I was astonished at the change of atmosphere in this room as compared with all

the rooms into which I had already been and I asked the Superintendent the meaning of it. He explained that these were the older boys who had behaved well during their time at the Reformatory, and were now many of them working in the neighbouring town. They were given complete freedom of movement, and were never locked in like the younger boys. They were even allowed to smoke, the privilege of most young Dutchmen after the age of sixteen or seventeen. I enquired why this obviously successful treatment was not applied throughout, for it seemed to produce such evident happiness and contentment. But I was told that the younger "delinquents" were not ready for such freedom. Evidently they were not meant to be happy.

Although other reformatories in Holland are probably run on more enlightened lines, I am told that similar conditions pervail in many of the reformatories in America. At one of which I know the boys are made to walk into the dining room in "lock step", and are not allowed to speak at meals. At another "home" the boys for trivial offences have their heads held under water until they gasp for breath.

But at one place in America I have come across the work of one who ten years ago started an experiment in the treatment of "juvenile delinquents" based on the belief that there is no such thing as a bad boy, and that "virtue is not a hard conformity to a law felt as alien to the natural character, but a free expression of the inner life." This is the Starr Commonwealth for Boys situated at Albion in Michigan. Rabindranath Tagore visited this School and afterwards wrote to Mr. Floyd Starr, its founder, as follows :

"My visit to your place has been to me like some oasis with its spring of the water of life. Other

things of bigger dimensions will be forgotten, but the memory of your little school will remain a part of my life to the end—because I had a touch of truth there and came away richer than when I visited the place. It was a real joy to me to see the creative work you are doing for your boys, for you are showing, what I myself have always so strongly believed, that every boy responds to sympathy and trust by developing the qualities that are in him."

Mr. Starr started his home with the intention of trusting his boys absolutely. One of his earliest "delinquents" was regarded as incorrigible by the judge of the town where he lived. He had been brought before the Court over and over again on the charge of house-breaking and robbery. He was thirteen years of age, and when he was brought before the Court with eight separate charges against him, the judge finally decided to commit him to the Reform School. Mr. Starr was present in Court and asked to be allowed to take him into his own home. Permission was given on condition that he would be responsible for his good conduct. On reaching home Mr. Starr said to the boy:

"Now, Harold, you are a member of my family. I never lock my doors and I keep all my ready cash in this drawer of which I have lost the key. You are to sleep upstairs, and there is nothing to prevent you from getting up in the night and stealing out of the house with that money in your pocket, but *I know you won't do it.*"

Mr. Starr has told me of the look of indescribable astonishment that came into the boy's eyes. He was silent for a moment; then he suddenly held out his hand, saying:

"Well, if you are going to give me a straight deal,

I guess, I can give you the same. I've never been trusted before."

And from that day to this Harold has not given a moment's trouble. A year later he went to a Public School Boy's Camp where he won, by popular vote, a loving Cup awarded each year for the best all-round boy in Camp. That was seven years ago and now Harold has returned to the Commonwealth as one of Mr. Starr's most valued helpers.

Some time after Mr. Starr had started his work he had a visitor who came to see his work. He began to talk in the sitting-room about a certain Reformatory he had visited. He spoke of its excellent equipment and added that Judge B. sent all his worse cases there, even cases of burglary and of forgery. As he spoke he noticed a bright looking boy in the room begin to look very uncomfortable and eventually walk out. Mr. Starr explained that he was one of Judge B.'s cases and had been committed for forgery and theft.

"But," exclaimed the visitor, "wasn't that the boy who was in your car when you met me at the station?"

"Yes," said Mr. Starr.

"And didn't you let him get out in town to take a music lesson?"

"Yes," replied Mr. Starr.

"And didn't you give him some money for his car fare back here?"

"Yes."

"Well, but isn't that risky? How can you trust him?"

"I trust him," said Mr. Starr, "because he has never for a moment given me cause to doubt him. He has been here six months and behaved splendidly. In fact he's one of my best boys."

"Tell me about him," said the visitor.

"His story," answered Mr. Starr, "is typical of many that I could tell you, but it is interesting as it shows what trust does for a boy." And he told the following story. Ralph was left in charge of his mother by a father who had deserted her. She was forced to go out to work, and to take in lodgers, so she had not much time to give to her son. He ran rather wild, and often played truant from school, besides getting into scrapes with companions who, like him, had no proper home life. He was very fond of good clothes, and could not bear to be seen shabby or unclean. But he had not money for dressing well, and one day he disappeared after forging and cashing a cheque. He had often been before the Court, and had been given many chances to "make good" at home. But this time the judge resolutely refused to give him another chance. Friends of the boy asked Mr. Starr to take him into his home and he agreed when he found that the only alternative was the Reform School. Before accepting the responsibility he turned to the boy and said: "Ralph, I intend to trust you, and I want to know whether you will give me a fair, square deal." Ralph did not say much, but he answered, "Yes, I promise I will." Mr. Starr took him and he never went back on his word. The only trouble he had with him was that for a long time he thought that fine clothes made the man. One day when Mr. Starr was ploughing in the field a limousine drove up, and Ralph came running breathless and saying: "Uncle Floyd, go quick, and change your clothes, before the visitors come," to which Mr. Starr replied: "I certainly shall not. If the visitors want to see my best clothes you can take them to my room, open my wardrobe and they will see them hanging up in the

corner. But if they want to see me, they can see me out here."

Next year when Ralph was going daily to the High School, three miles away, and was known to all the boys and girls of the town, he would often drive the team to fetch soft coal for the Commonwealth, and he was never ashamed of greeting his friends when he himself was wearing his coal-begrimed overalls. Now that boy is doing brilliantly, and is as bright and clean looking a boy as you could wish to meet.

The history of Waldo is equally interesting. It begins with the record of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children into whose hands he came at an early age. "Child, male. Parents and name unknown. Age, probably four or five." He had been found in the street of a city, and he could give no account of himself except that his mother had recently died leaving him and a baby sister to the care of his father. After the funeral the father had taken the children home, and after a short time went out with the baby girl, leaving the boy in the house. He was away a long time, and when he returned he was alone. After some supper the father took him out to see the stores, and while the boy was absorbed in looking into a brightly lighted shop window, the father disappeared and the child found himself alone in the crowded streets. This is all the boy remembers of his first "home." For five years he was taken care of by various people, but he proved so foul in his language and so filthy in his personal habits that no family was willing to keep him. Further than this he lied and stole, whenever he had the chance, until at last he came before the Juvenile Court. Mr. Starr was asked to take him. He had been given the name "Waldo Graham," but no one knew when he was born. The day

he came to the Commonwealth was a cold, gray, dismal day of autumn, and when he arrived Mr. Starr's mother made him sit beside her on the sofa, and asked him: "Well, Waldo, who is there, I wonder, who loves you?" His little lips quivered and his big brown eyes filled with tears as he answered: "I guess there ain't nobody, except just God!"

Years have passed since then and although enquiries have been made, no trace of his parentage has been recovered. Nothing remains but the meagre memory of his last day at home. Now the boy is a strong, healthy and vigorous youngster who works well on the farm and enjoys life. After he had been two years at the Commonwealth he one day just before Christmas came to Mr. Starr and said: "Uncle Floyd, I haven't any money but I want to give something to help some of the poor boys in Detroit to have a Happy Christmas. Will you let me go without one or two dinners before Christmas and send the money saved to some poor boy? If I were not here I might be sleeping on a doorstep or under a bridge to-night. There are hundreds of boys like that."

Mr. Starr suggested that perhaps other boys in the Commonwealth might like to do the same, and when Waldo made his proposal at supper that night it was carried unanimously. Ever since then, every Christmas time, the members of the Starr Commonwealth voluntarily go without one of their best meals in order to be able to give to the poor. This year $ 25.00 was given to provide milk for the children of a neighbouring town whose parents were too poor to provide it for them.

These cases are sufficient to show the nature of the work which is being carried on at the Starr Commonwealth. Each case is true in every detail, and they are all typical of the dozens of cases which are passing

through the school. People who come to visit the place are struck by the happy and manly attitude of the boys, and they shake hands with a sincerity and look one straight in the eyes in a way that demonstrates the clean and healthy life they lead. In the neighbouring town of Albion a merchant recently stated that the Starr Commonwealth boys were easily distinguished by their courtesy and polite manners. And these are boys who are, most of them, designated as "delinquents" by the State, and in many cases are not wanted by their own parents. Even those who have homes of their own could not grow up to a clean and healthy manhood in such an environment.

It may be asked whether the boys never give any trouble, and the answer is that of course they do or they would not be boys. But the trouble they give is merely that which is inevitable to growing children and to the period of adolescence during which youth has to adapt itself to the requirements of a world ruled by age. Sometimes boys run away, not because they are unhappy, but because they are possessed by the "Wanderlust" which is characteristic of all healthy boyhood. Usually two run away together, and they have a time of excitement and adventure till they fall again into the hands of the police and are delivered into the clutches of the law. When they return they are not punished by being deprived of their liberty, though sometimes the Self-governing Council decides on some form of deprivation. The last three who ran away in the pursuit of adventure came back as naturally into the life of the Commonwealth as if they had been away on a holiday. They arrived in the evening just as the weekly Movie Show was to take place in the School House, and they sat amongst the other boys as if nothing had happened.

The subject is never referred to by those who are working in the Commonwealth, the teachers and matrons leaving it for Mr. Starr to talk individually to the truants. The punishment decided on for the three boys referred to was to deprive them of the pleasure of taking part in an Entertainment given by the classroom to which they belonged. As they were the only three who did not contribute to the programme, they looked quite shame-faced as they sat amongst the audience.

One day I was present when the stepmother of one of the boys who had just recently come called to see her child. He had been incorrigible in the streets of his own town where his father was a man of good position. He delighted in smashing windows, robbing stores, and generally making himself a nuisance to his grown-up neighbours. Since coming to the Commonwealth he has been bright and happy and always behaves in a most gentlemanly manner. His mother said that she had never seen such a change in anybody as had come over this lad during the month he had been there.

What then is the explanation of this miracle? For to those who have known many of the boys in their home life it seems in most cases little short of miraculous to see the way the characters of the boys are transformed.

The secret is twofold. There is first the attitude of Mr. Starr towards his boys. He trusts them and loves them as if they were his own sons. The Commonwealth is not an institution but a real "home." The boys are remembered on their birth-days, they are given periodical treats as they would be in any good home, and are encouraged to be themselves in the best sense. One of the boys keeps bees, another studies birds, while others interest themselves in machinery. There is no uniform as Mr. Starr believes in individuality being expressed in

difference of dress as in other things. The fact that all the boys call Mr. Starr, "Uncle Floyd," speaks for itself, but it needs someone who has lived at the Commonwealth for a few days to realise how devoted these youngsters are to him. When they see him crossing the Campus they call across to him "Hullo, Uncle Floyd!" One day one of the Cottage Mothers overheard some of the boys talking, and one of them said: "I think Uncle Floyd is one of the richest men in America." "Why?" asked another. "Because," answered the first, "all of us boys love him so much."

The second explanation follows inevitably from the first. Where the boys are treated in this spirit there is created a spontaneous "public opinion" amongst them which makes it a matter of pride to them that not one of their number should do anything to disgrace the good name of the Starr Commonwealth for Boys.

As Judge Hoyt says in his recent volume, "Quicksands of Youth": "It is often curious and gratifying to find how ready and willing boys are to help in improving conditions if they can be made to understand just why and how their assistance might be of value. But the appeal must be made in full sincerity, as man to man, for a maudlin plea or a harsh command would be equally ineffectual in arousing their interest or enlisting their sympathy. *I have found in certain cases no more effective agents for the maintenance of law and order than boys themselves*, if they are properly handled and guided."

Mr. Starr appeals to the best that is in the boy knowing it to be there, and he has seldom been disappointed. His experiment has proved so eminently successful that it ought to be tried in all attempts at "reforming" boys. Sir Horace Plunkett recently visited the Starr Commonwealth and wrote to a friend afterwards of his

"keen appreciation of the work of Mr. Floyd Starr." He said: "It is surely worth while to try the principles of human development which Mr. Starr has adopted with such amazing success in individual cases and advantageous conditions. I felt when I looked over his boys, talked to them and got to know the spirit which they had imbibed, that everyone of them will be to some extent a missionary in after life."

A recognition is necessary that it is not the boy who needs to be reformed so much as his environment, and that the boy himself is the one most ready to co-operate in any effort to improve him. As Mr. L. E. Meyers, an experienced worker amongst boys in Chicago, has said:

> "Those longest experienced in boys' work are unanimously of opinion that the normal boy is fundamentally good, and experience has proved beyond all doubt that the under-privileged boy will respond whole-heartedly to the effort to help him."

IV

TAGORE'S SCHOOL AT SHANTINIKETAN

IN every country in the world one sign of the coming of a New Age is the revival of creative ideals in education, and in India we see such a revival. The school of Rabindranath Tagore is a conspicuous example of this vital renewal of the nation's life.

To all travellers in India who are interested in education and in literature a visit to the School of the illustrious poet Rabindranath Tagore is inevitable, and every cold weather sees large numbers of visitors from every part of the world to Shantiniketan where the School is situated. It was originally founded as an "Asram," or "religious retreat" for worship and meditation by the poet's father. It is two miles from the village of Bolpur which is itself about a hundred miles from Calcutta.

My first visit to Bolpur is memorable. When I arrived at the station it was just sunset, the time picturesquely called in Bengal the "cow dust" time, for it is then that the cattle are driven from the fields, and the sun sets behind a golden mist raised by the cows as they slowly make their way to the village.

Arriving at the School I was greeted by one of the teachers who took his meals in the guest house while I was staying there. We sat out under the open sky on the balcony and watched the faint crescent of the moon

rise above the tops of the trees which surround the School buildings. Two of the boys came and sang one of the poet's songs leaving me to spend the evening with a teacher. As we discussed the ideals of the School the sound of the boys' voices, as they returned to their dormitories after their evening meal, gradually died away, and in the stillness there was a sound of singing. It was a group of boys who, every evening before they retire to bed, sing one of the poet's songs. Gradually they approached the house where we were, and then as they turned away the sound became fainter and fainter till it died away altogether. Then silence descended like shadows on a star-lit hill, and I realised why the name "The House of Peace" had been given to the place.

In the morning, before sunrise, the band of young singers wakened the sleeping schoolboys to the work of the day by another song. Probably the singers themselves had been wakened by the songs of the birds!

After an early morning walk to a neighbouring village, where some of the older students conduct a night School for the boys of the illiterate villagers, I attended service in the temple, a building open to the light and air on all sides. As I entered, the boys were seated, some on the marble steps outside, and some on the white marble floor, in an attitude of meditation. After an opening prayer in Bengali, the boys stood up and chanted a Sanscrit verse ending with the words,

"Om, Shanti! Shanti! Shanti!"

(Om, Peace! Peace! Peace!)

The sound of this chant filling the fresh morning air with the solemn notes of youthful aspiration was very moving.

In the temple there is no image and no altar, for the

poet's father Maharshi Debendranath, who founded the Asram, declared that Shantiniketan should allow no image to be worshipped and no man's religious faith to be criticised or abused. There he insisted "the one invisible God is to be worshipped, and such instructions are to be given as are consistent with the worship, the praise, and the contemplation of the Creator and Maintainer of the world, and as are productive of good morals, religious life, and universal brotherhood."

The service was short, consisting only of the prayers and an address given by the poet. It was most impressively devotional in spirit and the surroundings were beautiful. The clear sunlight filtered through the screen of trees which shield the temple from the direct heat of the sun, and on all sides could be heard the chirping of birds and the cooing of doves.

During the day I came to know many of the teachers, and listened to the boys singing. The poet's songs occupy a large part of the School life, and the School song composed by Dr. Tagore is sung on many occasions. The words of it are translated as follows,

"She is our own, the darling of our hearts, Shantiniketan.
Our dreams are rocked in her arms.
Her face is a fresh wonder of love everytime we see her,
For she is our own, the darling of our hearts.

In the shadows of her trees we meet,
In the freedom of her open sky.
Her mornings come and her evenings
Bringing down heaven's kisses,
Making us feel anew that she is our own, the darling of our hearts.

The stillness of her shades is stirred by the woodland whisper;
Her *amlaki* groves are aquiver with the rapture of leaves.
She dwells in us and around us however far we may wander.
She weaves our hearts in a song making us one in music,
Tuning our strings of love with her own fingers,
And we ever remember that she is our own, the darling of our hearts."

But without the music, also composed by the poet, no idea can be given of the exquisite beauty of the song.

One evening, as it was a moonlight night, we went out, boys and teachers as well, to a wood about a mile from the School. We sat in a circle under the trees. The boys sang, one of the teachers told a story, and we went on talking till late. Then we walked back across the open country which lay still and quiet under the spell of the Indian moonlight.

The School buildings stand amongst trees in the middle of an open heath which stretches to the horizon on all sides so that one feels as if standing on the roof of the world. On nights when the full moon sheds a flood of white peace upon the landscape one can walk for miles across open country with nothing to obstruct the view except here and there a neat little village surrounded by a few cultivated fields. On the distant line of the horison groups of tall palm trees stand like the warning forefingers of the guardian spirits of the place raised against all thoughtless curiosity of outside intrusion. The whole surroundings are filled with tranquility and peace. Sometimes the music of a flute is heard as a village boy plays on his bamboo reed after

his day's work is over. In the evenings and early mornings just at sunset and sunrise, when the temple bell has called the boys to their worship, a silence strangely still and beautiful seems to fill the air, and in the early hours of the morning, long before the first peep of light in the East, the stillness is so intense that it seems as if the dew itself had ceased to fall.

Shantiniketan was originally a bare spot in the middle of open country. It was notorious for being a haunt of robbers. It was to this spot that Maharshi Debendranth, the father of Rabindranath, came on one of his journeys, and he was so deeply attracted to the place that he pitched his tent under three trees which he found there and for weeks at a time spent his days in meditation and prayer. These trees are still to be seen, with the wide open plain stretching out before them to the Western horizon, and on the marble slab which marks the place of his meditation can be seen the words which filled his mind.

> "He is the repose of my life,
> the joy of my heart,
> the peace of my spirit."

It is under these trees that the boys meet when they commemorate the life of Maharshi, or others whose lives are closely associated with the Asram.

This custom of holding meetings out of doors is characteristic of the School, where all classes are held under trees or in the verandahs, except during the rains. The boys often organise some out-door entertainment in the evenings, such as a circus performance or a small play written by the boys themselves. To these the teachers are invited, though the whole programme is organised without their help. It is this freedom of individual expression which is so vital a part of Dr.

Tagore's system of education. He believes that education consists, not in merely imparting information, but in allowing individual development the freest scope possible. One of the things that strikes a visitor to the School is the look of happiness on the boys' faces, and there is evidently none of that feeling of dislike for school life which is often found in those institutions the only object of which is to cram the pupils full of "useful knowledge." Examinations have been abolished in the lower classes, and even in the higher classes are only held once a year to test each boy's progress, the boy's own teacher being his examiner.

At the end of each term arrangements are made for staging one of the poet's plays. The teachers and boys take the different parts, and visitors come from Calcutta to see the performance, especially if the poet himself is taking a part. The poet coaches the actors himself, first reading the play aloud, and then reading the individual parts with those who are to take part. During the days when the play is being rehearsed not many classes are held, for all the boys of the School are present at the rehearsals. In this way the ideas of the poet are assimilated by the boys, without their making any conscious effort. In fact they are being educated into his thought through the subconscious mind. This is one of the root principles of Tagore's method of education. This idea of the acquisition of knowledge unfettered by hidebound rules is seen in every department of the School life. Dr. Tagore has two or three of Bengal's most distinguished artists living at the School and carrying on their own work of painting. There is no compulsory Art Class but the boys who are naturally artistic crowd round these artists as they work and then bring their own efforts for help and criticism. In this

way the Art Class is formed as an inevitable fruit of the unrepressed instinct for artistic expression. The same holds good for Music. There are two brilliant instrumentalists at the School and one singer, a nephew of the poet's, who teaches to the boys all Tagore's songs. All the boys love music and those who have good voices or a natural gift for instrumental music are able to learn from these musicians. In this way the Music Class is formed. In Literature and other subjects this tendency to free development is encouraged wherever practicable. Dr. Tagore wishes that every teacher should take up some research work, either in their own subject or some other branch of study. In this way the teachers retain their freshness and become co-workers with their pupils, instead of mere machines for giving out daily a definite measure of facts.

Even in religion the same rule largely holds. There are no religious classes as such, though every day the boys have the early morning period of silence for meditation and a similar period in the evening. Each boy takes his small square rug into the open field or under a tree when the temple bell rings and for fifteen minutes sits in silence. He is not dictated to as to the subject of his thoughts, but unconsciously he is influenced by the Sanscrit texts from the Upanishads which the boys chant together, and acquires the habit of silence.

At the weekly services there is no dogmatic teaching. An address is given, generally by Dr. Tagore himself, in which is given the speaker's own philosophy of life. These addresses are given in Bengali and many of them have been published though few of them have been translated into English. The following brief outline of one of his recent addresses will give some idea of the character of his thoughts :

"A tree has its unspoken prayer; it flows in its sap rom the tips of its deepest rootlets to the tips of its deepest branches. That prayer is a prayer for growth, growth into the freedom of sunlight and air. This is the one prayer which tingles in all its branches and leaves, and therefore the tree is beautiful. It bears flowers and fruits, it fulfils its purpose which is the purpose of all creation. But human beings have not come into the unity of their prayers; they are not only different in different nations but they are antagonistic. Our prayers are the chorus to the symphony of God's will. If they are discordant then the music is marred. The prayer of nations is for victory of their own people as against others and for the exploitation of other races and dominance over them. But this goes against the truth of prayer, the prayer to our common Father.

"Deep in the heart of all humanity there is this one prayer trying to find utterance in its history:

'Lead me from the unreal to the Real
from darkness to light
from death to deathlessness.'

"This prayer is like the prayer of the river which is, in all its waves, to be led into the sea.

"Human beings have not been able to discover this true prayer, the truth of God as Father, and though by word of mouth we take His name and call Him Father we contradict our words by our actions and life both as individuals and as nations. Therefore we need this other prayer which is:

'Thou art our Father. Let our consciousness awaken to the truth that
Thou art our Father, and then let us bow to Thee.'"

It may seem that such thoughts are too profound for ordinary boys, but the poet believes, in this matter also,

that often the subconscious mind is able to apprehend truths which the conscious mind cannot. It is certainly true that the boys of Shantiniketan are able to understand one of Dr. Tagore's addresses more easily than much more advanced students from Calcutta.

The morning I left Bolpur on a visit to Japan sometime ago there was a farewell ceremony in accordance with the ancient Hindu custom when a guest leaves an Asram. I was garlanded and a handful of rose petals, with some grains of paddy and some sacred grass symbolic of the plenitude and fruitfulness of life, was offered to me. At the same time the following blessing in Sanscrit was pronounced. It is from the Hindu book "Sakuntala:"

"Pleasant be thy path with intervals of cool lakes green with the spreading leaves of lotus—let its dust be gentle for you even like the pollen of flowers borne by the calm and friendly breeze—may your path be auspicious and may it be sheltered by shady trees tempering the glare and heat of the sun."

V

A CHARACTER STUDY OF M. K. GANDHI

ONE striking sign of the New Age is the appearance on the world's horizon of a man who wields a vast influence over millions by the mere assertion that soul force is more mighty than physical force.

Whatever may be one's personal opinion of M. K. Gandhi, there can be no doubt that he is a remarkable man. Remarkable because his standard of conduct and method of action are so entirely different from those of other Indian leaders. Statesmen and politicians are seldom guided by the motives which compel Gandhi to action, and the very fact that in him we see a man who wields enormous influence over his countrymen by a character—the exact antithesis of the ordinary political leader—gives to his personality a peculiar interest. One Governor of a British Province in the East has described him as "a dangerous and misguided saint." Everyone, whether foe or friend, agrees in regarding him as a saint. And it is because of his evident saintliness of character that he has such an unparalleled influence in India at the present day.

In a recent article on Gandhi in an American magazine he was described as "A Monk who imperils British Rule in India." That one man by the force of his austere and ascetic character should be regarded as a

menace to one of the greatest Empires that has ever existed, is in itself a remarkable phenomenon. During the Prince of Wales' visit to the large cities of the different provinces, the streets, on many occasions when the Prince was passing through the city, were almost deserted. This is a striking enough circumstance in view of the great reverence with which royalty has been regarded in India throughout her history, and is a contrast to the welcome which was given to King George on his visit. But more striking than the deserted streets in the presence of the son of the Emperor were the crowded streets whenever Gandhi passed through any of these cities. In Delhi, the present capital, when Gandhi arrived a crowd of 20,000 took possession of the railway station and was permitted by the station officials to superintend the arrival of the train in which the popular leader was travelling. As he drove through the streets of Delhi there were crowds lining every thoroughfare numbering more than 100,000.

The explanation of this phenomenon is simple. Not only do the people, the masses of India, reverence Gandhi as a saint, but he has practically unlimited influence over them in the sphere of national aspiration. But this is not because he is primarily a politician. He has none of the usual qualifications for political success. He is not diplomatic, for he lays all his cards on the table. He never compromises and has never been known in his public life to rely on expediency rather than on principle. He belongs to no party and has therefore no party ambition, and he is unmoved by the criticisms of friends and enemies alike. He himself has said:

> "Most religious men I have met are politicians in disguise: I, however, who wear the guise of a politician, am at heart a religious man."

He is a man who, by the very example of this ascetic life, would attract the masses in India whatever his policy might happen to be, and it is just because of the great influence which he exercises over the people that he is regarded as so dangerous an opponent of British rule in India. He cannot be bribed or tempted by personal ambition to change his methods. He is a man who, having once accepted a principle, will not yield an inch even to those whom he knows to be his friends, even though he knows that by yielding he might gain large numbers of adherents. Some people have said that he is easily influenced by those around him, and is being used as a tool by the Extremist leaders who regard his fame as a saint as a valuable asset for their own propaganda. As a matter of fact no man is less readily influenced or diverted by external pressure from his purpose than Mr. Gandhi. I came across a striking example of this some years ago when I first had the privilege of meeting Mr. Gandhi.

It was in the autumn of 1913 that trouble arose in South Africa because of the treatment of the Indian residents in that Colony. Gandhi had for years been struggling on behalf of his fellow-countrymen to assert their rights in South Africa as fellow-citizens with the white subjects of the British Empire. He had given up a lucrative legal practice in order to devote his whole time to this cause. A crisis was reached in October 1913 owing to the action of Mr. Gandhi in starting an extensive Passive Resistance Movement aimed at inducing the Union Government to grant their demands. As a result of his appeal thousands of men, women and children marched without permits from Natal into the Transvaal, while many others went on strike in the mines and sugar plantations. The Government arrested

and imprisoned thousands, converting the mines into jails to accommodate the unprecedented number of prisoners. Mr. Gandhi as well as two or three European sympathisers were also imprisoned. Feeling in India at the news ran high, so high indeed that the Viceroy. Lord Harding, made a strong public protest in a speech in Madras against the treatment of Indian citizens of the Empire in South Africa. In every province of India the people united in protest and the Government both in India and in England became alarmed. At last the South African Government, realising the danger to the Empire, hastily appointed a Commission to enquire into the grievances of the Indian community, and at the same time released the Indian leaders in order that they might give evidence. But in appointing the commissioners they did not appoint any nominee or representative of the Indian community. They did not even consult the Indian leaders as to the scope and character of the Commission. Mr. Gandhi protested and asked that the Indian community be allowed to appoint at least one representative to serve on this Commission, but the Government refused. Mr. Gandhi then made the announcement that as a protest he would neither give evidence himself nor could he advise any self-respecting Indian to give evidence. This would obviously stultify the work of the Commission and at the same time would give to the critics of Indian aspirations the occasion for saying that the Indians refused to give evidence simply because their evidence was weak. In India, the great Indian statesman and politician, the Hon. G. K. Gokhale, for whom Gandhi had the profoundest admiration and love, saw this clearly enough and was almost daily sending cables to Mr. Gandhi urging him to reconsider this decision.

Mr. Gokhale felt that such a boycott of the Commission would be sure to have a detrimental effect on any sympathy which the Indian case had aroused both in England and in South Africa itself. But Mr. Gandhi was adamant on this point. He regarded the honour and self-respect of the Indian community as at stake, and although he realised that he was going against the wishes of the one Indian whom he respected above all others and that Mr. Gokhale was right in so far as political expediency was concerned, he would not retract, and the Commission sat without hearing the evidence either of Gandhi or any other Indian of position or influence.

I remember clearly being greatly struck with this unusual and unyielding allegiance to principle. On a point of honour Mr. Gandhi would never compromise, and since then though I have seen him under very different circumstances I have never known him to compromise the honour and self-respect of India. It is this quality which seems to some to be his weakness because for the sake of some distant and unattained ideal he often loses for the time being some obvious but temporary advantage. But in reality it is this quality which constitutes Gandhi's strength, for everyone who has to deal with him knows that he will never accept any policy or accede to any request which he himself believes to be contrary to his principle of Truth. We may disagree with him as to what is Truth, we may disapprove of the methods he adopts for achieving his ends, but one thing is self-evident to all who come into contact with him and that is the fact that Gandhi is absolutely disinterested in his actions and cares not at all for his own personal popularity or position.

In appearance he is not at first striking. His very asceticism makes him insignificant physically. He

personifies an idea and when he is expressing it his body does not seem to count. When I first met him in South Africa he was taking only one meal a day and that consisted of fruits, nuts, and whole meal bread with olive oil. He took very little sleep and from early morning till late at night he was busy interviewing people, discussing plans of campaign, and writing important dispatches to India and to the Government authorities in Pretoria. But however busy he was, he always had time to talk with the poorest of the coolies who came to see him and to consult him constantly. He would ask them often to come and sit by him as he took his meals in order that he might have more time for talking to them. The poorest people felt that he was their friend for he had a word for all. When he went to Pretoria to see General Smuts and General Botha he was dressed in the simple homespun which he always wears, and walked barefoot. His face expresses great patience and love, and to me he seemed nearer to my idea of Saint Francis of Assisi than anyone I had ever seen. He believed intensely in the ultimate victory of those who try to "Conquer hatred by love," and never allowed people to express hatred towards those whom he regarded as treating his fellow-countrymen unjustly. He strives with implacable insistence by the force of moral suasion to compel his rulers to yield to his demands for fair and just treatment.

He expects this unfaltering loyalty to Truth in his followers, and although gentle and very tolerant towards those who differ from him, over those who once ally themselves to him he exerts a moral authority which is almost despotic. Regarding celibacy as the highest state for service of humanity he expects those who live in his community to observe the same rule of continence that

he has imposed upon himself. Also he is a rigid vegetarian though he does not assume an air of moral superiority on that account.

He is chivalrous to his opponents and never takes advantage of the weakness of those who are opposing him however tempting the opportunity may be. This quality he was shown once or twice in his recent campaign, but the following example will suffice. Shortly after his release from jail early in 1914 a serious strike broke out amongst the white labourers on the Rand. Gandhi had a week previously threatened to re-start the Passive Resistance Movement and to call the Indian coolies in the mines and on the plantations out on strike as a protest against the lack of representation on the Commission referred to above. Instead of taking advantage of the difficulty in which the Government was placed, Gandhi announced that the Passive Resistance Movement would be entirely suspended until the Government was free from the embarrassment caused by the strike on the Rand. Had he chosen he could have carried out his threat while the Government's hands were filled with the Rand Strike, and probably might have gained much for which he had been for so long struggling. But he was chivalrous to his opponent and General Smuts was the man to appreciate chivalry of this kind, for when later the Indian question again came up for discussion he was found in a frame of mind much more ready to listen to the Indian point of view. But this was not done as a matter of tactics; it was a point of honour to fight clean. In the end it proved to be good tactics also, for by the middle of 1914 most of the demands of the Indian community were met and laws were passed in the Union Parliament granting juster treatment to Indians in the Colony.

I have described Mr. Gandhi's public activities in South Africa, but in order to know the complete character of the man it is necessary to say something of his private life. Near Durban he had a Settlement which was a community based on the principles of service. It was situated at Phoenix, and it was there that one saw Gandhi in the atmosphere and surroundings in which his characteristic unselfishness was most apparent. It was modelled on the lines which Tolstoi had advocated at the close of last century. Mr. Gandhi had a profound admiration for Tolstoi and his teachings, and possibly owes more of his present attitude on the value of Passive Resistance to that great Western Teacher than to the teachings of his own religion, though *ahimsa* (aversion to slaughter or inoffensiveness) is one of the chief doctrines of the Hinduism which Gandhi both practises and preaches. It was at this Settlement that one saw Mr. Gandhi co-operating in the work which the boys and other members of the community were engaged in. Often did I protest against the way in which Mr. Gandhi spent his valuable time, in the midst of his great public responsibilities, in menial tasks which could so easily have been carried out by less prominent members of the Settlement. When the Hon. Mr. Gokhale was a guest at Phoenix, he had the same experience, and he often told humorously of the heartless tyranny of his host who insisted upon doing the most menial tasks, including that of the sweeper, for his guests. To protests he would reply that as regards a piece of work which had to be done and got through there was no highness or lowness about it—if a piece of work was thought to be too dirty for him (Gandhi), it should be regarded as too dirty and low even for any poor sweeper, who was just as much a human being as he himself.

It is this readiness to make the same sacrifices which he asks those who follow him to make which gives to him his moral authority. As a writer recently has said of him:

> "Mr. Gandhi has always been prepared to accept and has always actually accepted for himself the direct logical outcome of his principles, whatever hardship and breach of social convention it may involve. This, combined with his utter sincerity, the austere simplicity of his life and his readiness to serve the people at all costs and sacrifice, explains his unparalleled hold over his countrymen. No trick or posing can give such influence to any leader."

When Mr. Gandhi gave up a lucrative legal practice in Johannesburg, the annual income from which was over $15,000, in order that he might serve his countrymen, he was obeying the same impelling call which came to Saint Francis of Assisi, and later to Tolstoi. But although he felt that poverty was necessary to himself because it gave him freedom, he does not ask others to follow his example and amongst many of his most enthusiastic friends and admirers are men of wealth and position. His desire was to win for the Indians of South Africa the equality which he regarded not only as the right of every citizen of the British Empire, but also as the right of every human being. But although he fought the Government to win the justice he knew was the right of his countrymen, he co-operated whenever possible with the very Government whose abuses he was attempting to remove. He received the Zulu war medal for his services as the officer in charge of the Indian Volunteer Service Corps in 1906, and the Boer war medal for his services as Assistant Superintendent of the Indian Volunteer Stretcher Bearer Corps during the Boer War

of 1899—1900. He was also later decorated by the Indian Government with the Kasier-i-Hind gold medal for his humanitarian work in South Africa. It was his hope that by showing the readiness and ability of Indians to share in the dangers and responsibilities of the Empire he would win for them some measure of respect. These medals he has now returned to the British Government as a protest against the action of the authorities in regard to the Turkish Peace Treaty and their attitude to those who were responsible for the shooting of hundreds of innocent people at Amritsar. Up till quite recently he had believed in the ultimate triumph of justice because he trusted the British people to see that justice was done. Now that hope he has surrendered as will be seen from his open letter to "Every Englishman in India," extracts from which follow.

Addressing his letter " Dear Friend " he continues:

"Let me introduce myself to you. In my humble opinion, no Indian has co-operated with the British Government more than I have for an unbroken period of twenty-nine years of public life in the face of circumstances that might well have turned any other man into a rebel. I ask you to believe me when I tell you that my co-operation was not based on the fear of the punishments provided by your laws or any other selfish motives. It was free and voluntary co-operation based on the belief that the sum total of the activity of the British Government was for the benefit of India. I put my life in peril four times for the sake of the Empire. I did all this in the full belief that acts such as mine must gain for my country an equal status in the Empire. So late as last December (1919) I pleaded for a trustful co-operation. I fully

believed that Mr. Lloyd George would redeem his promise to the Mussalmans and that the revelations of the official atrocities in the Punjab would secure full reparations for the Punjabis. But the treachery of Mr. Lloyd George and its appreciation by you, and the condonation of the Punjab atrocities have completely shattered my faith in the good intentions of the Government and the nation which is supporting it."

He goes on to explain why he has faith in Passive Resistance or Civil Disobedience.

"I know you would not mind if we could fight and wrest the sceptre from your hands. You know that we are powerless to do that, for you have ensured our incapacity to fight in open and honourable battle. Bravery on the battle field is thus impossible for us. Bravery of the soul still remains open to us. I know you will respond to that also. I am engaged in evoking that bravery. Non-co-operation means nothing less than training in self-sacrifice. Why should we co-operate with you when we know that by your administration of this great country we are being daily enslaved in an increasing degree. This response of the people to my appeal is not due to my personality. You are in search of a remedy to suppress this rising ebullition of national feeling. I venture to suggest to you that the only way to suppress it is to remove the causes. You have yet the power. You can repent of the wrongs done to Indians. You can compel Mr. Lloyd George to redeem his promises. I assure you he has kept many escape—doors. You can compel the Viceroy to retire in favour of a better one. You can revise your ideas about Sir Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer. You can compel the Government to summon a conference of the recognised leaders of

the people, duly elected by them and representing all shades of opinion so as to devise a means for granting Swaraj (Self-government) in accordance with the wishes of the people of India. The other solution, namely, repression, is open to you. I prophesy that it will fail."

Most Englishmen in India regard Gandhi as a clever politician who attains his political ends by masquerading under the cloak of a saint. It is true that no other politician in India has succeeded in doing what Gandhi has done, uniting the people of every Province in a common demand for freedom. Even the late Mr. Gokhale, the greatest Indian statesman of modern times and Gandhi's ideal politician, did not succeed simply because he measured the immediate consequences of his actions in a way which Gandhi never does.

Gandhi has succeeded in awakening the 'common feeling of nationality' of which Sir John Seeley speaks in his "Expansion of England." When, referring to India, he wrote:

"If there could arise in India a nationality-movement similar to that which we witnessed in Italy, the English power could not even make the resistance that was made in Italy by Austria, but must succumb at once."

Mr. Gandhi believed for many years in the doctrine of gradual evolution towards self-government and tried the method of co-operation with the British Government whenever possible. But at length he has adopted a more incisive method, and has created in the masses the feeling that it is shameful to be under foreign domination. Sir John Seeley wrote:

"If the feeling of a common nationality began to exist in India only feebly; if, without any active

desire to drive out the foreigner, it only created a notion that it was shameful to assist the foreigner in maintaining his dominion, from that day, almost, our Empire would cease to exist."

Sir Michael O'Dwyer writing recently in the London "Fortnightly," has said:

"Since the Mutiny, the position of our government was never so weak, its credit never so low.

"Our margin of safety in India was never very large, and in these days of world-wide anxiety and peril it has been reduced almost to vanishing point."

But it would not have been possible for Gandhi to have created this feeling had not external circumstances concurrently converted the masses of the people to the belief that the continuance of foreign rule was no longer tolerable. For the last twenty years the desire for a greater share in the government of their country has been growing rapidly in India, and many methods have been attempted to attain this end. The Indian National Congress has met year after year and talked, the Swadeshi movement in Bengal, which started after Lord Curzon's attempt to partition Bengal in the teeth of the unanimous opposition of the people, had its enthusiastic response in the imagination of the whole of Bengal, while religious organizations like the Arya Samaj in the Punjab, and the Ram Krishna Mission started by followers of Swami Vivekananda in Bengal—all had their share in educating the people to a realisation of their own rights. But none of these went so directly to the root of the matter as Gandhi's preaching of Non-co-operation. He showed that in thousands of subtle ways Indians were by their co-operation with the existing form of government simply prolonging its life.

He pointed out that no government can exist except with the co-operation of the people.

Seeley's words are coming true, and, they are coming true because of the influence of this one man, Gandhi. A recent writer in India has said of him:

> "Mahatma Gandhi cuts at the very root of the disease. He is like a surgeon performing an operation, rather than a physician administering soothing drugs. And, as his surgeon's knife cuts deep, we can see at once the recovery of self-respect and manhood and independence."

Never before in the history of the British connection with India have the Indian people been so fearless in their protest against the disabilities under which a dependent nation almost inevitably suffers. Up till quite recently the Indian people believed in the ultimate triumph of their cause because they believed in the justice of the British people and Parliament. But since the close of the War faith in both Parliament and in the British people has almost vanished owing mainly to three causes. There was first the Turkish Peace Treaty which violated the promises made to the thousands of Mahomedan soldiers from India who had fought on the understanding that the integrity of the Khilafat would be preserved. Secondly, there was the passing of the Rowlatt Act, a repressive measure passed shortly after the Armistice in the face of the unanimous protests of Indian public leaders and politicians. And thirdly, there was the tragedy of Amritsar when an unarmed crowd was fired on without warning by the order of General Dyer with a resulting loss of 1200 killed and 2000 wounded. A year later, when the facts were fully known to the British public the Debates in both Houses of Parliament proved beyond a doubt that the horrors of

the Great War had deadened the conscience of the British people, for in the House of Lords a vote of confidence in the administration was passed while in the House of Commons a weak protest was recorded which resulted in General Dyer being retired from the Service and receiving a pension of $4,000 paid out of the Indian taxpayers' pocket. Had India accepted such a verdict from Great Britain without strong protest, she would have forfeited the respect of the rest of the world.

But a further cause of dissatisfaction is the reaction upon India of the treatment of Indians in other parts of the British Empire, and this is perhaps the gravest issue, for it is one which the people of Great Britain are powerless to change. In every part of the British Empire outside India itself the position of Indian citizens of that Empire is one of definite inferiority, and even in India itself the Englishman is a privileged person. Australia excludes all Asiatics under the "White Australia" policy. Canada does not allow Hindus to enter her dominions as she did before, and South Africa has since the Armistice introduced laws attempting to keep Indians in a position of permanent inferiority and has even tried to get rid of all the Indians she can by the passage of a Repatriation Bill. Even New Zealand which until recently had no anti-Asiatic legislation has now adopted a policy similar to that of Australia so that in no part of the British Empire are Indians accepted on terms of equality.

It is hardly surprising that these facts should be resented by those of the Indian people who realise their implication. With regard to the acts of the Government of India itself, the British Parliament, which is the ultimate authority in the government of India, does not offer any means of redress, while in the Empire itself

the chances of equality of treatment are becoming fewer instead of increasing. The British Empire cannot exist "half free and half slave." India will never be respected as long as she accepts such a position of inferiority without protest. However great may be the benefits and advantages of British rule in India they cannot compare with India's honour and self-respect. The facts are clear. Great Britain cannot force her Colonies to accept Indian subjects of the Empire on terms of equality. Indians cannot any longer remain in an Empire which persists in treating them as inferior to the white members of that Empire. Here is the impasse, and the facts are stubborn. England could not go to war with her own Colonies in order to gain justice for India. The only way open is for India to claim her rights as an independent nation.

Her population is disarmed so that an armed rising is unthinkable, yet she feels that right is on her side. Gandhi has appealed to the people of India at this critical moment to use moral force against the armed might of her rulers. It is, he tells them, their one hope. But it means sacrifice and suffering, for Non-co-operation is regarded by Gandhi as "a measure of discipline and self-sacrifice." He frankly confesses that his wish is to paralyse the Government so as to compel justice from it, or alternatively to supplant the present government by one purely Indian. In his own words:

> "My speeches are intended to create 'disaffection' as such that people might consider it a shame to assist or co-operate with a Government that had forfeited all title to confidence, respect or support."

He has stated that if he had to choose between the honour of the Punjab and therefore of India, and the British connection, he would choose the honour of the

Punjab and all that it meant—anarchy even—without the slightest hesitation.

Mr. Gandhi has expressed his views very clearly in the following words, which appeared nearly a year ago in his weekly paper " Young India."

" I draw no distinction between the Imperial and the Indian Government. The latter has accepted, on the Khilafat, the policy imposed upon it by the former. And in the Punjab case the former has endorsed the policy of terrorism and emasculation of a brave people initiated by the latter. British ministers have broken their pledged word and wantonly wounded the feelings of the seventy million Mussulmans of India. Innocent men and women were insulted by the insolent officers of the Punjab Government. Their wrongs not only remain unrighted, but the very officers who so cruelly subjected them to barbarous humiliation retain office under the Government.

" When at Amritsar last year I pleaded with all the earnestness I could command for co-operation with the Government and for response to the wishes expressed in the Royal Proclamation, I did so because I honestly believed that a new era was about to begin, and that the old spirit of fear, distrust and consequent terrorism was about to give place to the new spirit of respect, trust and goodwill. I sincerely believed that the Mussulman sentiment would be placated and the officers who had misbehaved during the Martial Law regime in the Punjab would be at least dismissed and the people would be otherwise made to feel that a Government that had always been found quick (and rightly) to punish popular excesses would not fail to punish its agents' misdeeds. But to my amazement and dismay I have discovered that the present

representatives of the Empire have become dishonest and unscrupulous. They have no real regard for the wishes of the people of India and they count Indian honour as of little consequence.

"I can no longer retain affection for a Government so evilly manned as it is nowadays. And for me, it is humiliating to retain any freedom and be witness to the continuing wrong. Mr. Montagu, however, is certainly right in threatening me with deprivation of my liberty if I persist in endangering the existence of the Government. For that must be the result if my activity bears fruit. My only regret is that inasmuch as Mr. Montagu admits my past services, he might have perceived that there must be something exceptionally bad in the Government if a wellwisher like me could no longer give his affection to it. It was simpler to insist on justice being done to the Punjab and to the Mussulmans than to threaten me with punishment so that the injustice might be perpetrated. Indeed I fully expect it will be found that even in promoting disaffection towards an unjust Government I had rendered greater services to the Empire than I am already credited with."

Gandhi has been able to unite the people of India as they have never before been united not only because of his unfaltering loyalty to a moral ideal and by his austere and ascetic personal life, but because the British Government has itself fed fuel to the fires of national aspiration. Confronting the most powerful Empire in existence stands one man, Gandhi, who cares nothing for his own personal life, who is uncompromising and fearless in the application of principles which he has once accepted, and who scorns any longer to receive or beg for favours from a Government which he regards

as having "forfeited all title to confidence, respect or support." He believes in conquering hate by love, in the triumph of right over might, and all the effort of his public life is directed towards persuading the masses of India of the truth of this ideal. Just as the triumph of Christ's life was his crucifixion by those in authority, so the triumph of Mahatma Gandhi's work and the certainty of its success is seen in his arrest by British Government and the monstrous sentence of six years' imprisonment passed on him. Scorning to accept any favour from the hands of the Government, he has welcomed his arrest and imprisonment because it is the final proof of the justice of his cause and of its ultimate triumph.

VI

INDIA'S PLACE IN THE NEW AGE

WITHOUT doubt, in the transition stage through which the world is passing on its way towards the New Age, many re-adjustments, not only of social and political standards but also of international relationships, will have to be made. It may be worth while then to examine the probable position of India as a self-governing nation in that community of Nations which *will form the World Commonwealth of the Future.*

There has been much discussion between politicians of the moderate and of the extremist parties in India as to whether India should form a part of the British Empire when she attains Swaraj or whether she is destined to be outside that Empire. But this question of the political position of India in the future is of minor importance compared with the position of moral leadership which she seems destined to attain. From a practical point of view it is doubtful whether even at present India is an integral part of the British Empire. For purposes of rhetoric she has sometimes been referred to as "the brightest gem" in the crown of Britain's Emperor, but this description does not tell us what advantage India herself gains from being thus described. Does India exist solely for the prestige of the British or has she some role to play on the world's stage equal in importance to that of other great nations? From a

practical standpoint we may say that India is not within the British Empire even at the present time and it is very unlikely that she ever will be. Her interests are not consulted nor are her citizens admitted on terms of equality in any part of the British *Dominions. The* presence of a Lord Sinha or of a Sastri at Imperial Conferences may deceive the public of the West too indolent to wish to dispel their own ignorance of matters relating to India and her welfare, but to anyone who knows the actual state of affairs in different parts of the Empire this is a flagrant falsehood which should be exposed if the world is to be under the dominion of Truth.

India has a mission to fulfil in the world and the Age of the Future depends for its development on the right lines, upon India being true to that mission. In order to do this India must retain or regain her self-respect and refuse to accept the humiliation of being regarded as a merely inferior appendage to a mighty Empire.

As Sj. C. R. Das says in his presidential address on "The Fight for Freedom":

> "We stand then for freedom, because we claim the right to develop our own individuality and evolve our own destiny along our own lines, unembarrassed by what Western civilisation has to teach us and unhampered by the institutions which the West has imposed on us."

The facts speak for themselves. Let us see what position India has been forced to accept in the past.

England has had before her two ideals of Empire, one which has been accepted by her idealists and the other which has been practised by her politicians. The former is a free federation of nations held together without the employment of force in which all distinctions

of creed and colour should be subordinated to the common welfare of all. The latter is that of a combination of the white people of the Empire in which they shall have full freedom to exploit those weaker races over whom they have obtained control and whom they can permanently treat with contempt as inferior to themselves. Had England pursued the first ideal she would have had very little Empire to speak of, for Canada, South Africa, Hongkong and more than all India would never have come into the Empire at all unless force had been used. It is true that now some parts actually remain freely as parts of that Empire, but only those that are free and only so long as the people of England respect all their liberties. They remain parts of the Empire because they find some moral and material advantage in maintaining the connection, exactly as was the case in all other Empires the world has known in which the liberty of some parts does not condone for the slavery of others. For in all Empires such slavery is a fundamental injustice which cannot possibly persist and has indeed formed the principal cause of disintegration. It cannot be otherwise so long as the conception of Imperial expansion takes precedence of the ideal of the equal treatment of all races. And in practice it cannot be denied that England's attitude towards the coloured races in her Empire has been either practically to exterminate them (as in Australia) or where that has been found impossible because of their numbers she has relegated them to a position of permanent inferiority. We see, for example in South Africa, where the "native" population vastly outnumbers the white colonists, that being unable to exterminate them the Government passes legislation which renders the rightful inheritors of the soil as innocuous as possible.

The Native Lands Act, for instance, which was passed the year before the outbreak of the War, deprived the natives of the right to possess or even to rent any land in the best and most desirable parts of the Colony, such lands being made available only for the white settlers whose appetite is insatiable.

The position to which Indians have been degraded in almost all parts of the Empire shows that India is not accepted as an integral part of the Empire and never will be. This is no fault of the Indian people who inherit a civilisation older than that of the English themselves. The facts of the treatment of Indians in different parts of the Empire are so well known that it is superfluous to mention them in any detail. In South Africa the struggle for equality of rights has been going on for more than thirty years, from the Dominion of Canada Indians are practically excluded, while in both Australia and New Zealand legislation is aimed at keeping them entirely "white". In Kenya Colony there is an example of a monstrous injustice towards Indians going on before our very eyes and we are practically helpless to avert the danger to Indian interests and Indian rights. We may therefore say that in actual fact India is not a part of the British Empire and the different Dominions of the Empire are quite determined that she never shall be. Why therefore should politicians waste time in discussing whether India should be within or outside an Empire which has already by common consent come to the unanimous decision to exclude her from partaking of its privileges? Even if the majority of her political leaders wished to make India an integral part of the British Empire, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Kenya and South Africa are all equally determined that she shall not be allowed to become so, and these

Dominions are powerful enough to make their united will felt in the Councils of Great Britain.

Not then as a Dependency of the British Empire can she fulfil her destiny but, being rejected by that Empire, she will be able to realise her dependence on the realm of the Spirit, and by claiming allegiance not to any earthly Empire but to the Kingdom of Heaven she will accomplish her divine mission. If only she remains true to her Dharma and is not misled into copying the evil methods of western civilisation, her position is assured. If those who lead her destinies believe in the power of the spiritual life and teach her people that if once they can learn to master themselves they will have mastered the whole world, then India's mission to lead the world into this New Age will be fulfilled. She can do so if she refuses to be blinded by the teaching of the west and has courage to depend upon the unseen powers of the spirit, for not upon material resources will the New Age be built but upon spiritual foundations.

It may seem strange that India whose message to the world is that of Unity, unity of man with God, and unity of man with man, should be the nation to suffer most as an outcaste in the Empire of which she is supposed to form a part, but this very fact may be the means taken by Providence for converting India to a realisation in practice of that which she has recognised in theory for centuries. Sinned against by other parts of the Empire she must cease to sin against her own people. To quote the inspiring words of Monsieur Paul Richard in his "To India":

"Thou shalt live as a nation when thou shalt cease to sin against Humanity! For to abuse one man is to sin against all. Thou hast created the people of

the "pariahs". So hast thou become the pariah of peoples!

"National egoism was not enough. Provincial egoism was still too broad for thee. Thou hast to descend to the pettiest of all that of caste. Reject all these egoisms. Live in Love and thou shalt live!

"In love and unity. Unity is not only the watchword of all Asia. It is also that of all India. It is the *mukti*, the only possible *mukti* for India as for Asia.

"Thou claimest equality among people and races. And thou wouldst not have it among castes! . . . Thou shalt be the sister of all nation only when all thy sons among themselves are brothers.

"And all thy daughters, their sisters and equals! . ."

Let us then accept the inevitable consequence of the selfish and narrow Imperialism which excludes India from England's Empire and ask what place India can hold in the great Commonwealth of the New Age. The answer depends largely on India herself and on her conception of her mission in the world.

One of the most remarkable and noticeable facts of recent years is the way in which in Europe and America where Modern Civilisation seems to be on the verge of collapse, many of the idealists and thinkers who desire to re-shape civilisation on spiritual lines are looking to Asia for inspiration and leadership having realised the complete bankruptcy of the west to produce such leadership. Some, not idealists, look to China in the hope that her great material resources may save

Europe from the calamity which her own greed has brought upon her. But the mere exploitation of the untold mineral resources of China will not only not solve the problem of Europe, but would in all probability lead Asia also into the same extensive and bitter misery in which the west is now plunged. It is not to material wealth or mineral resources that mankind should look for the keynote of the new Age. The mastery of outer Nature has led the West to a turmoil tragic in its effects on humanity and now the great need of all mankind is the mastery of the inner life. In order that man may make proper use of the vast resources which Science has opened up to him he must be guided in social and political matters by sages. Here lies the secret of India's role for the Future. All her great men of the Past and those who are truly regarded as great in the present age are men who discovered the power of self-mastery and recognised the supreme necessity for spiritual conquest. If India is to take her rightful place of leadership in the new age, the age of Mankind's spiritual civilisation, the age of the Coming of God's Kingdom upon Earth, then she must be true to her traditions and emphasise the essential necessity of developing man's inner and spiritual powers.